

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now present in this application.

The specification and claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 have been amended, and claims 10-23 have been presented. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

It is noted that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on April 16, 2004. Notification of receipt of this Information Disclosure Statement by the Examiner, as well as consideration of the documents cited therein, are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claim 5 (sic). It is believed that this is a typographical error since the lines referred to are passages found in claim 1. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection to the claims should now be overcome and withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims should particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by SAYEGH et al., U.S. Patent 5,253,318. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by STUEMKY et al., U.S. Patent 4,990,125. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over SAYEGH et al. in view of O'DONNELL, U.S. Patent 5,881,843. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over STUEMKY et al. in view of O'DONNELL. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The patent to SAYEGH et al. discloses an optical fiber ribbon cable. This arrangement is for optical waveguide fiber cables. Therefore, this is not a hoisting rope for a traction sheave elevator.

Independent claim 1 specifically recites a hoisting rope for a traction sheave elevator. It has been further recited in the body of the claim that the rope is attached to the elevator car. There is no suggestion or motivation for placing SAYEGH et al.'s device in this arrangement. In fact, if the optical fiber of SAYEGH et al. were arranged in such a manner, it would likely destroy its function of being an optical waveguide fiber.

The STUEMKY et al. reference is for a flat belt, belt drive, and method. This drive arrangement is again not a hoisting rope for a traction sheave elevator. There is no suggestion or reason to attach the rope of STUEMKY et al. to an elevator car. The secondary reference to O'DONNELL would not overcome these noted deficiencies of the primary reference.

Apart from independent claim 1, the dependent claims further distinguish the instant invention from the utilized prior art. For example, dependent claim 3 recites that the sheath provides friction coefficient against the traction sheave. There is no interaction with a traction sheave in either SAYEGH et al. or STUEMKY et al.

Dependent claim 4 recites that the planar surface of the sheath is coated with a layer of wear-resistant material having a friction coefficient relative to the material of the traction sheave. Again, the primary references relied upon by the Examiner have nothing to do with a traction sheave in an elevator environment.

The various bundles and strands which form fabric or which are arranged in bundled groups as recited in other dependent claims is not found in the utilized prior art.

Turning to newly presented independent claim 19, an elevator rope arrangement is set forth. In this arrangement, a first and second rope are attached to the elevator car. The first rope includes metallic suspension ropes while the second rope is a synthetic material. Neither the SAYEGH et al. nor STUEMKY et al. deal with elevator rope arrangements. It is respectfully submitted that this independent claim 19 as well as its dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance. All claims now in the instant application should now be in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$420.00 is attached herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By



Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

f61 P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

#43,360

KM/asc
1381-0287P

(Rev. 02/12/2004)